

**AMENDMENT TO THE DRAWINGS**

The attached sheet of drawings, which includes FIG. 1, replaces the original sheet 1/5.

FIG. 1 is amended to include a legend identifying the figure as a "Prior Art" drawing.

**REMARKS**

This is in response to the Office Action mailed on August 16, 2005, in which claims 1-11 and 13-23 were pending. In the Office Action, objection was made that FIG. 1 lacked a "Prior Art" label. This has been corrected with the present Amendment. Also in the Office Action, claims 10, 11, 13, 22, and 23 were rejected as being indefinite and also over the prior art. With this Amendment, claims 10, 11, 13, 22, and 23 are canceled. The Examiner also indicated in the Office Action that claims 1-9 were allowed, and that claims 14-21 were allowable if rewritten in independent form. With this amendment claim 14 has been amended to independent form, such that claims 1-9 and 14-21 are in condition for allowance. Notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

**Objection to the Drawings**

In the Office Action, FIG. 1 was objected to as requiring a "Prior Art" label. Attached with this Office Action is a replacement sheet for FIG. 1 containing the appropriate label.

**Claim Rejection - 35 U.S.C. § 112**

In the Office Action, claims 10, 11, 13, 22, and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Specifically, the Office Action states that the "feedback networks" are not coupled to the first and second input signal nodes.

With this Office Action, claims 10, 11, 13, 22, and 23 have been canceled. However, as described below (See, "Allowable Claims"), claim 14 has been rewritten in independent form to include the limitations of canceled claim 10. In addition, dependent claims 15-21 depend from amended independent claim 14.

The rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112 should now be withdrawn with respect to claims 14-21, because independent claim 14 has been amended to clarify the structure of the networks. Specifically, independent claim 14 now includes a first, a second, a third, and a fourth resistor network which more accurately describe the structure of the claimed invention.

The Office Action also states, “resistors R1 through R3 are not part of any feedback circuitry, and it is thus improper to refer to them as such.” (Number 3, lines 9-11.) With this Amendment, the term “feedback network” has been changed to “resistance network.”

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102 and § 103

In the Office Action, claims 10, 11, 13, 22, and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and also under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). With this amendment, claims 10, 11, 13, 22, and 23 have been canceled, thus rendering this rejection moot.

Allowed Claims

The allowance of claims 1-9 is gratefully acknowledged.

Allowable Claims

In the Office Action, claims 14-21 were indicated to be allowable if rewritten in independent form. With this Amendment, claim 14 has been amended to include the limitations of canceled claim 10, and is now an independent claim. In addition, claim 14 has been amended to overcome the rejection to claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, as described above. As a result, independent claim 14 and dependent claims 15-21 are in condition for allowance.

First Named Inventor: Jason P. Brenden

Application No.: 10/619,802

-10-

Conclusion


The application containing pending claims 1-9 and 14-21 is in condition for allowance.

Notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees associated with this paper or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 11-0982.

Respectfully submitted,  
KINNEY & LANGE, P.A.

Date: 11/2/2005

By:   
Dina M. Khaled, Reg. No. 52,761  
THE KINNEY & LANGE BUILDING  
312 South Third Street  
Minneapolis, MN 55415-1002  
Telephone: (612) 339-1863  
Fax: (612) 339-6580

DMK:BAT